REMARKS

In the final Office Action, the Examiner:

• rejects claims 30, 33-35, 39, 42, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly

unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,058,944 to Sponheim et al. (hereinafter "SPONHEIM") and

further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,643,661 to Polizzi et al. (hereinafter "POLIZZI");

• rejects claims 36, 44, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over

SPONHEIM and POLIZZI, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,634,051 to Thomson

(hereinafter "THOMSON");

• and rejects claims 41 and 46-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over

SPONHEIM and POLIZZI, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,098,064 to Pirolli et al.

(hereinafter "PIROLLI"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

By way of this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 30, 33, 36, and 46 to improve

form, cancel claims 39, 41-43, and 46-48 without prejudice or disclaimer, and add new claims

49-51. No new matter has been added by the present Amendment. Claims 30, 33-36, 44-45, and

49-51 are pending.

Statement Regarding Substance of Interview

In accordance with Applicants' duty to submit a statement regarding the substance of an

interview, Applicants submit that a telephone interview occurred on January 21, 2011 between

Examiner Sangwoo Ahn and Viktor Simkovic, Applicants' representative. Initially, Applicants

wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended in the interview.

During the interview, Applicants' representative explained that SPONHEIM and

POLIZZI do not disclose or suggest a server device to assign one or more of a keyword or

phrase, a topical category, or a geographic category to each one of the plurality of custom news

sections of a custom news document, embed search queries into the news content, where each of

the embedded search queries includes the assigned one or more keywords, one or more topical

categories, or one or more geographic categories associated with the news content, receive, from

a client device, a request to access the news content, and send the embedded search queries

across a network to a second server, in response to receiving the request. Applicants'

representative further explained that the Javascript implementing the active glossary function of

SPONHEIM is not associated with any assigned keyword or phrases. Rather, the active glossary

function performs a search based on a text that is selected by the user.

Applicants' representative further emailed a proposed new claim (now claim 49) to the

Examiner that incorporates the features discussed above. The Examiner made further

amendments to the proposed claim to include a plurality of custom news sections, which the

Examiner apparently believes would place the proposed claim in condition for allowance. While

not agreeing that the Examiner's proposed changes are necessary for placing any of Applicants'

claims in condition for allowance, Applicants' representative have amended the claims along the

lines suggested by the Examiner, in order to expedite prosecution.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SPONHEIM and POLIZZI

Pending claims 30 and 33-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly

unpatentable over SPONHEIM and POLIZZI. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended independent claim 30 is directed to a system that includes a first server and a

second server. SPONHEIM and POLIZZI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable

combination, do not disclose or suggest one of more of the features recited in claim 30.

For example, SPONHEIM and POLIZZI do not disclose or suggest a server device to assign one or more of a keyword or phrase, a topical category, or a geographic category to each one of the plurality of custom news sections of a custom news document, embed search queries into the news content, where each of the embedded search queries includes a respective one of the assigned one or more keywords, one or more topical categories, or one or more geographic categories associated with a respective one of the plurality of custom news sections, receive, from a client device, a request to access the news content, and send the embedded search queries across a network to a second server, in response to receiving the request, as recited in amended claim 30.

The Examiner relies on col. 5 line 66 to col. 6, line 13 of SPONHEIM for allegedly disclosing "a first server to embed search queries into the news content" (final Office Action, p. 4). Without acquiescing in the Examiner's allegation regarding the previously recited version of claim 30, Applicants submit that this section (or any other section) of SPONHEIM does not disclose or suggest the above-noted feature of amended claim 30.

Col. 5, line 63 to col. 6, line 13 of SPONHEIM disclose:

> The active glossary function also creates a communications back channel through which data indicative of the selected element(s) may be sent and a corresponding response may be received. By way of example, scripting may be employed to create an inline floating frame 74 in response to a proper selection 70. The inline floating frame 74, which provides the back channel, may be created by using an insertAdjacentHTML method to dynamically add an IFRAME tag to the end of the HTML of the current document. The iframe is created and initially added to the page with its SRC attribute empty. The inline floating frame 74 may be completely transparent to the user or it may be configured to be very small (e.g., about one pixel) so as not to be noticeable to a user. A <FORM></FORM> block also is added to the HTML of the current document (e.g., by the insertAdjacentHTML method). The form block provides a mechanism in which selected data may be sent through the inline floating frame.

The active glossary function of SPONHEIM is not associated with an assigned one or more of a keyword or phrase, a topical category, or a geographic category, and, therefore, the active glossary function of SPONHEIM does not correspond to an embedded search query, as recited in claim 30. Rather, the active glossary function of SPONHEIM "is event driven and responsive to

user-generated events for dynamically creating a back channel to the remote computer. By way of example, the user-generated event may be an action event from the user input device 24, such as a pointer device (e.g., a mouse-up event) or a keyboard (e.g., based on predefined keystrokes)" (see col. 5, lines 34-39 of SPONHEIM). Thus, the active glossary function of SPONHEIM, or any code associated therewith, is not associated with any particular content until a user makes a selection (see item 70 of Fig. 1B of SPONHEIM).

Therefore, this section of SPONHEIM does not disclose or suggest a server device to assign one or more of a keyword or phrase, a topical category, or a geographic category to each one of the plurality of custom news sections of a custom news document, embed search queries into the news content, where each of the embedded search queries includes a respective one of the assigned one or more keywords, one or more topical categories, or one or more geographic categories associated with a respective one of the plurality of custom news sections, receive, from a client device, a request to access the news content, and send the embedded search queries across a network to a second server, in response to receiving the request, as recited in amended claim 30.

POLIZZI does not overcome the deficiencies of SPONHEIM set forth above with respect to the above-noted feature of amended claim 30.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 30 is patentable over SPONHEIM and POLIZZI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SPONHEIM and POLIZZI be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 33 recites, among other things, assigning, by one or more server devices, one or more of a keyword or phrase, a topical category, or a geographic category

to custom news sections of a custom news document, and embedding, by the one or more server devices, search queries in particular locations of the custom news document, where the search queries include a respective one of the assigned one or more keywords, one or more topical categories, or one or more geographic categories, associated with a respective one of the custom news sections.

As stated above with respect to claim 30, SPONHEIM and POLIZZI do not disclose or suggest a server device to assign one or more of a keyword or phrase, a topical category, or a geographic category to each one of the plurality of custom news sections of a custom news document, embed search queries into the news content, where each of the embedded search queries includes a respective one of the assigned one or more keywords, one or more topical categories, or one or more geographic categories associated with a respective one of the plurality of custom news sections, receive, from a client device, a request to access the news content, and send the embedded search queries across a network to a second server, in response to receiving the request.

Therefore, SPONHEIM and POLIZZI do not disclose or suggest assigning, by one or more server devices, one or more of a keyword or phrase, a topical category, or a geographic category to custom news sections of a custom news document, and embedding, by the one or more server devices, search queries in particular locations of the custom news document, where the search queries include a respective one of the assigned one or more keywords, one or more topical categories, or one or more geographic categories, associated with a respective one of the custom news sections, as recited in amended claim 33, for at least reasons similar to the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 30.

Therefore, claim 33 is patentable over SPONHEIM and POLIZZI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SPONHEIM and POLIZZI be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 34 and 35 depend from claim 33. Therefore, these claims are patentable over SPONHEIM and POLIZZI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 33. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 34 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SPONHEIM and POLIZZI be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SPONHEIM, POLIZZI, and THOMSON

Claims 36, 44, and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over SPONHEIM and POLIZZI, further in view of THOMSON. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended independent claim 36 recites, among other things, one or more instructions to assign one or more keywords or phrases, one or more topical categories, or one or more geographic categories to each one of the plurality of custom news sections and one or more instructions to embed search queries within the custom news document, where the embedded search queries comprise an applet or an iframe that includes one or more instructions to submit respective ones of the one or more keywords or phrases, one or more topical categories, or one or more geographic categories to a news search server.

As stated above with respect to claim 30, SPONHEIM and POLIZZI do not disclose or suggest a server device to assign one or more of a keyword or phrase, a topical category, or a

geographic category to each one of the plurality of custom news sections of a custom news document, embed search queries into the news content, where each of the embedded search queries includes a respective one of the assigned one or more keywords, one or more topical categories, or one or more geographic categories associated with a respective one of the plurality of custom news sections, receive, from a client device, a request to access the news content, and send the embedded search queries across a network to a second server, in response to receiving the request.

Therefore, SPONHEIM, POLIZZI, and THOMSON do not disclose or suggest one or more instructions to assign one or more keywords or phrases, one or more topical categories, or one or more geographic categories to each one of the plurality of custom news sections and one or more instructions to embed search queries within the custom news document, where the embedded search queries comprise an applet or an iframe that includes one or more instructions to submit respective ones of the one or more keywords or phrases, one or more topical categories, or one or more geographic categories to a news search server, as recited in amended claim 36, for at least reasons similar to the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 30.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 36 is patentable over SPONHEIM, POLIZZI, and THOMSON, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SPONHEIM, POLIZZI, and THOMSON be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 44 and 45 depend from claim 36. Therefore, these claims are patentable over SPONHEIM, POLIZZI, and THOMSON, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 36. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully request that the rejection of claims 44 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on

SPONHEIM, POLIZZI, and THOMSON be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SPONHEIM, POLIZZI, and PIROLLI

Claims 41 and 46-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable

over SPONHEIM and POLIZZI, further in view of PIROLLI. Applicants have canceled claims

41 and 46-48, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

New Claims

New independent claim 49 recites features similar to the features discussed above with

respect to claim 30. Therefore, claim 49 is patentable over the cited references for at least the

reasons set forth above with respect to claim 30.

New dependent claims 50 and 51 depend from claim 49. Therefore, these claims are

patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim

49.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the

Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the

Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise which could be

eliminated through discussions with Applicants' representative, then the Examiner is invited to

contact the undersigned by telephone in order to expedite prosecution of this application.

As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such assertions (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, reasons to modify a reference and/or to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, assertions regarding Official Notice, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & HARRITY, LLP

By: /Viktor Simkovic, Reg. No. 56,012/
      Viktor Simkovic
      Registration No. 56,012

Date: February 2, 2011
11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Main: (571) 432-0800
Direct: (571) 432-0899
Customer Number: 44989